arXiv:1601.04968v2 [math.AP] 4 Aug 2016

On a model for the Navier–Stokes equations using magnetization variables

Benjamin C. Pooley*

August 5, 2016

Abstract

The Navier–Stokes equations can be reformulated in terms of so-called magnetization variables w that satisfy

$$\partial_t w + (\mathbb{P}w \cdot \nabla)w + (\nabla \mathbb{P}w)^\top w - \Delta w = 0, \tag{1}$$

and relate to the classical velocity u via a Leray projection $u = \mathbb{P}w$. Working on the 3-dimensional torus, we review how this is an equivalent formulation for classical solutions. Moreover we prove that if $w \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ is a weak solution of (1), then $\mathbb{P}w$ is a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations. For a more regular weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ we show that there exists a solution w to (1) that is uniquely determined by the initial data w_0 such that $\mathbb{P}w_0 = u_0$.

We then prove global well-posedness in $H^{1/2}$ for the variant of (1), where $\mathbb{P}w$ is replaced by w in the second nonlinear term:

$$w_t + (\mathbb{P}w \cdot \nabla)w + \frac{1}{2}\nabla|w|^2 - \Delta w = 0. \tag{2}$$

This uses a maximum principle analogous to a similar property of the Burgers equations.

1 Introduction

The 3D Navier–Stokes equations model the flow of an incompressible viscous fluid and comprise the following system:

$$u_t + (u \cdot \nabla)u - \nu\Delta u + \nabla p = 0, \tag{1}$$

$$\nabla \cdot u = 0. \tag{2}$$

*B.C.Pooley@warwick.ac.uk
Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK
BCP was supported by an EPSRC Doctoral Training Award.

Here the velocity $u(x,t)$ is an unknown evolving vectorfield and $p(x,t)$ is the unknown scalar pressure. The viscosity $\nu > 0$ will not play a significant role in our analysis, so we take $\nu = 1$ hereafter. Many results about the local well-posedness and global existence for weak solutions of this system together with partial regularity results are well-known. For more on the classical theory of these equations, see [3], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14] and [20].

In this classical system the primary role of the pressure term is to provide an extra degree of freedom so that the incompressibility (2) does not make the system overdetermined. Indeed, in $\mathbb{T}^3$ or $\mathbb{R}^3$, ∇p can be determined from u using the incompressibility constraint and (1):

$$\nabla p = \nabla(-\Delta)^{-1}(\nabla \cdot [(u \cdot \nabla)u]),$$

i.e. p is determined (only up to a function of time) so that ∇p cancels out the gradient components of the nonlinear and forcing terms.

The Navier–Stokes equations can be reformulated as a system without an explicit pressure term using a so-called *magnetization variable* [15], where incompressibility is enforced via a Leray projection, instead. These variables are more well-known in the study of the Euler equations, and are so named because of an analogy with systems of magnets, see [5]. The reformulated system is as follows, where u can be thought of as the velocity in the classical formulation and w is the "magnetization" variable:

$$w_t + (u \cdot \nabla)w + (\nabla u)^\top w - \Delta w = 0 \tag{3}$$

$$u = \mathbb{P}w. \tag{4}$$

Here $\mathbb{P}$ denotes a Leray projection. Unless stated otherwise, the analysis in this paper will take place under periodic boundary conditions, and the spatial domain will be denoted by

$$\mathbb{T}^3 \coloneqq \mathbb{R}^3/2\pi\mathbb{Z}^3.$$

In Section 2 we will discuss the equivalence between the two formulations for classical solutions before proving new results about how they correspond for weak and strong solutions. Specifically, we will show that for a classical solution w of (3), $u = \mathbb{P}w$ is a solution of the Navier–Stokes equations for some p. Conversely for a classical solution of the Navier–Stokes equations there exists at least one classical solution w of (3) such that $\mathbb{P}w = u$. In the context of weak solutions on $\mathbb{T}^3$ (which are defined below), we will show that for a weak solution $w \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ the projection $\mathbb{P}w$ is a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations.

As a partial converse we show that if $u \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ is a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations then any w such that

$\mathbb{P}w = u$ for all $t \in [0, T)$ satisfies the weak form of (3) when tested against divergence-free functions, but possibly not in full generality.

We then consider (3) as a linear system for fixed $u \in L^\infty(0, T; H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{3/2})$ (without the requirement that $u = \mathbb{P}w$, necessarily) and show that for $w_0 \in H^{1/2}$ there exists a unique solution $w \in C^0(0, T; H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{3/2})$. To see that $u = \mathbb{P}w$ holds if u is a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations, we will observe that u and $\mathbb{P}w$ are both weak solutions of a certain Cauchy problem that has a unique weak solution (subject to compatibility of the initial data: $\mathbb{P}w_0 = u_0$). It follows that the two formulations are equivalent, in the context of weak solutions with the "strong" regularity: $u, w \in L^\infty(0, T; H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{3/2})$.

In Section 3 we prove global well-posedness in $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ for the system

$$w_t + ((\mathbb{P}w) \cdot \nabla)w + \frac{1}{2}\nabla|w|^2 - \Delta w = 0,$$

which is a simplification obtainted from (3) by replacing $u = \mathbb{P}w$ with w in the term $(\nabla u)^\top w$. This argument is based on a similar one applicable to the Burgers equations [17].

Our approach to the question of global well-posedness for the Navier–Stokes equations, via the analysis of a reformulation with modified nonlinearity, is in the spirit of other recent work. For example, Chae [4] discusses the equivalence between the Navier–Stokes equations and the system

$$\begin{cases} u_t + R \times R \times (u \times \omega) - \Delta u, \\ \omega = \nabla \times u \end{cases}$$

where

$$R \times u \coloneqq (R_2 u_3 - R_3 u_2, R_3 u_1 - R_1 u_3, R_1 u_2 - R_2 u_1)$$

is a combination of the Riesz transforms R_1, R_2 and R_3 on $\mathbb{R}^3$ applied to $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$. He then shows that the simplified system

$$\begin{cases} u_t + R \times (u \times \omega) - \Delta u, \\ \omega = \nabla \times u \end{cases}$$

is globally well-posed, in the sense of weak solutions $u \in C([0, T); H^m(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^{m+1}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ for $m > 5/2$.

In contrast, it is shown by Tao [21], that there exists an "averaged" version of the classical nonlinear term such that the modified system admits a smooth solution that blows up in finite time.

Throughout this paper we will find estimates using the fractional derivative operator Λ^s, defined by

$$\Lambda^s f(x) \coloneqq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3} |k|^s \hat{f}_k \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}k \cdot x} \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3),$$

for

$$f(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{f}_k \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}k\cdot x} \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3).$$

We also denote the seminorm $\|\Lambda^s \cdot\|_{L^2}$ on H^s by $\|\cdot\|_s$. Sometimes we will use the fact that $\|f\|_s \le \|f\|_t$ for $0 < s \le t$ and that $\Lambda^2 = (-\Delta)$. Note that the Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{H^s}$ defined by

$$\|f\|_{H^s} \coloneqq \left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^3} (1+|k|^{2s})|\hat{f}_k|^2\right)^{1/2}$$

is equivalent to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^2} + \|\cdot\|_s$.

2 Derivation and regularity

2.1 Classical solutions

The following propositions show that the systems (1)+(2) and (3)+(4) are equivalent for classical solutions on the interior of a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ (or on the torus $\mathbb{T}^3$). The manipulations in the proofs are similar to the derivation of the Weber formula [22] for the Euler equations as described by Constantin [6], see also [16].

Proposition 1. *If $u, w \in C^1([0,T]; C^2(\Omega))$ satisfy (3) and $u = \mathbb{P}w$ then there exists $p \in C^0([0,T]; C^1(\Omega))$ such that (u,p) is a solution of the Navier–Stokes equations (1).*

Proof. By the Helmholtz decomposition (see [20], for example), there exists $q \in C^1([0,T]; C^3(\Omega))$ such that

$$u = w - \nabla q.$$

It is clear that u is divergence free so we must prove that (1) is satisfied. Indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + (u\cdot\nabla)u - \Delta u &= w_t + (u\cdot\nabla)w - \Delta w - \nabla(q_t - \Delta q) - (u\cdot\nabla)\nabla q \\ &= w_t + (u\cdot\nabla)w - \Delta w \\ &\quad - \nabla(q_t - \Delta q + (u\cdot\nabla)q + \tfrac{1}{2}|u|^2) + (\nabla u)^\top w \\ &= -\nabla p, \end{aligned}$$

where $p \coloneqq (q_t - \Delta q + (u\cdot\nabla)q + \frac{1}{2}|u|^2)$. In the second line we used the commutation relation (see [6])

$$\begin{aligned} (u\cdot\nabla)\nabla q = \nabla[(u\cdot\nabla)q] - (\nabla u)^\top \nabla q &= \nabla[(u\cdot\nabla)q] - (\nabla u)^\top \nabla(w-u) \\ &= \nabla[(u\cdot\nabla)q] + \frac{1}{2}\nabla|u|^2 - (\nabla u)^\top w. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2. *If $u \in C^1([0,T];C^2(\Omega))$ and $p \in C^0([0,T];C^1(\Omega))$ satisfy the Navier–Stokes equations then for any $w_0 \in C^2(\Omega)$ such that $\mathbb{P}w_0 = u(0)$, there exists a unique $w \in C^1([0,T];C^2(\Omega))$ such that u, w satisfy (3) and $u = \mathbb{P}w$.*

Proof. By standard techniques for parabolic PDEs (see [7], for example) there exists a unique $q \in C^1([0,T];C^3(\Omega))$ such that

$$\partial_t q + (u \cdot \nabla)q - \Delta q = p - \frac{1}{2}|u|^2$$

and $q(t,x) = 0$ for all $(t,x) \in (\{0\} \times \Omega) \cup ([0,T) \times \partial\Omega)$. If we set $w \coloneqq u + \nabla q$ then $u = \mathbb{P}(w)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} w_t + u \cdot \nabla w + (\nabla u)^\top w - \Delta w &= u_t + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \frac{1}{2}\nabla|u|^2 - \Delta u \\ &\quad + \nabla q_t + (u \cdot \nabla)\nabla q + (\nabla u)^\top \nabla q - \nabla \Delta q \\ &= \nabla\left(-p + \frac{1}{2}|u|^2 + q_t + (u \cdot \nabla)q - \Delta q\right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence there exists $w \in C^1([0,T];C^2(\Omega))$ such that u, w satisfy (3) and (4).

Uniqueness follows from the fact that any two solutions w_1 and w_2 differ only by a gradient $\nabla\tilde{q}$ for some $\tilde{q}$ that satisfies

$$\partial_t \tilde{q} + (u \cdot \nabla)\tilde{q} - \Delta\tilde{q} = h(t);\ \tilde{q}(0,x) = C$$

for some function h that is independent of x, and some constant C. Hence $\tilde{q}$ depends only on time, and $\nabla q \equiv 0$. □

2.2 Partial equivalence for weak solutions

Proposition 1 can be strengthened to apply to weak solutions of (3) and (4). We say that $w \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ is a weak solution of (3) for initial data $w_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ if for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty([0,T) \times \mathbb{T}^3)$ and all $t \in [0,T)$

$$\begin{aligned} (w(t),\phi(t))_{L^2} + \int_0^t ((\mathbb{P}w \cdot \nabla)w + (\nabla \mathbb{P}w)^\top w, \phi)_{L^2} + (\nabla w, \nabla\phi)_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ = (w_0, \phi(0))_{L^2} + \int_0^t (w(s), \partial_t\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

We call a weak solution w a *strong solution* if it has the additional regularity $w \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$.

For the Navier–Stokes equations we use a similar definition of weak solutions: $u \in L^\infty(0,T;L^2) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ is a weak solution to (1) corresponding to the initial data $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ if for all divergence-free test functions

$\psi \in C_c^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)$ with $\nabla\cdot\psi\equiv 0$ we have

$$(u(t),\psi(t))_{L^2} + \int_0^t ((u\cdot\nabla)u,\psi)_{L^2} + (\nabla u,\nabla\psi)_{L^2}\mathrm{d}s \\ = (u_0,\psi(0))_{L^2} + \int_0^t (u(s),\partial_t\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \quad (6)$$

for all $t\in[0,T)$.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that $w\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2)\cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ is a weak solution of (3) for initial data $w_0\in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$. Then $u\coloneqq\mathbb{P}w$ is a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations for initial data $u_0=\mathbb{P}w_0$.*

Proof. The main ingredient in the proof is the fact that if $v\in H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$ then for all $\psi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$ with $\nabla\cdot\psi=0$ we have

$$((\mathbb{P}v\cdot\nabla)v + (\nabla\mathbb{P}v)^\top v,\psi)_{L^2} = ((\mathbb{P}v\cdot\nabla)\mathbb{P}v,\psi)_{L^2}. \quad (7)$$

For $v\in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$ we can argue as we did in the proof of Proposition 1 to prove (7). For $v\in H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$ we can consider a sequence of approximations in $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)$ and show that (7) passes to the limit.

Fixing a divergence-free test function $\phi\in C_c^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)$ and using the symmetry of the Leray projection, (5) becomes:

$$(\mathbb{P}w(t),\phi(t))_{L^2} + \int_0^t ((\mathbb{P}w\cdot\nabla)w + (\nabla\mathbb{P}w)^\top w,\phi)_{L^2} + (\nabla\mathbb{P}w,\nabla\phi)_{L^2}\mathrm{d}s \\ = (\mathbb{P}w_0,\phi(0))_{L^2} + \int_0^t (\mathbb{P}w(s),\partial_t\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

By (7) we can set $u\coloneqq\mathbb{P}w$ to obtain the required solution of (6). □

Another consequence of (7) is the following partial converse.

Corollary 4. *If $u\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2)\cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ is a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations then, for any $w\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2)\cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ such that $\mathbb{P}w=u$, w satisfies (5) for all test functions $\phi\in C_c^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)$ that are divergence free.*

Note that this does not imply that w is a weak solution of (3), since in the definition we allowed test functions with non-zero divergence.

2.3 Well-posedness of the linear system

In Section 2.4 we will show that a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations with the strong regularity $u\in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2})\cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2}))$ corresponds to a unique strong solution w of (3) such that $\mathbb{P}w=u$, subject

to fixing w_0 with $\mathbb{P}w_0 = u_0$. This will follow from the main result of this section, which gives well-posedness for the linear system

$$w_t + (u \cdot \nabla)w + (\nabla u)^\top w - \Delta w = 0 \tag{8}$$

(i.e. (3)), where $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ is fixed. In this section we do not assume that u solves the Navier–Stokes equations.

For $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$, we say that $w \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ is a *strong solution* of (8) if

$$\begin{aligned}(w(t),\phi(t)) &+ \int_0^t ((u\cdot\nabla)w(s) + (\nabla u)^\top w(s), \phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &= (w_0,\phi(0))_{L^2} + \int_0^t (w(s),\partial_t\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s - \int_0^t (\nabla w(s), \nabla\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

for all $t \in [0,T)$ and all $\phi \in C_c^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)$.

As in the case of classical solutions, there is a one-to-one correspondance between strong solutions of (5) and (6) (after fixing a correspondance between the initial data). We will prove this using the uniqueness from the following proposition and an analogous argument in the next section.

Proposition 5. *Fix $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ and $w_0 \in H^{1/2}$. There exists a unique strong solution w to (8).*

Before proving this we will define the Galerkin approximations that we will use and prove an important technical lemma. We denote by P_n the projection of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ onto Fourier modes of order at most n, i.e.

$$P_n\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{u}_k \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}x\cdot k}\right) = \sum_{|k|\le n} \hat{u}_k \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}x\cdot k}.$$

Let $w_n \in P_n L^2$ be the solution to

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w_n + P_n[(P_n u\cdot\nabla)w_n + (\nabla P_n u)^\top w_n] - \Delta w_n = 0, \\ w_n(0) = P_n w_0, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

which exists on a maximal time interval $[0,T_n)$, because this is a finite-dimensional system of Lipschitz ODEs.

In the proof of Proposition 5 we will show that w_n converges to a strong solution on some interval $[0,T)$ as $n\to\infty$. We will need to estimate $\|w_n\|_{H^s}$ in terms of $\|w_n\|_s$ and w_0 for certain $s>0$. If $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} w_n(t) = 0$ for all $t\in[0,T)$ then we could do this using a Poincaré-type inequality; however for a solution of (10) we cannot guarantee that momentum is conserved (the integrals of the nonlinear terms need not vanish), instead we can use the form of the equations to prove the following lemma.

Note that we do not assume that $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ in Proposition 5, because we would not gain much by such an assumption. Indeed the term $(\nabla u)^\top w$ may still break momentum conservation, even if u is divergence free. This is in contrast with the Navier–Stokes equations, where the corresponding nonlinear term is $(\nabla \mathbb{P} w)^\top w$, for which the integral over $\mathbb{T}^3$ vanishes.

Lemma 6. *If w_n solves (10), for some n, then for any $s > 0$ there exists $c_s > 0$ such that*

$$\|w_n(t)\|_{H^s} \le c_s \|w_n(t)\|_s + c_s \int_0^t \|w_n\|_{1/2} \|u\|_{1/2} + c_s \|w_n(0)\|_{L^1} \tag{11}$$

for all $t \in [0, T_n)$.

Proof. To save notation set $w \coloneqq w_n$. The zeroth Fourier coefficient of w satisfies

$$\left| \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \hat{w}_0 \right| = \left| \sum_{|k| \le n} \hat{u}_{-k} \cdot k \hat{w}_k + k \hat{u}_k \cdot \hat{w}_{-k} \right| \le 2 \|w\|_{1/2} \|u\|_{1/2},$$

so

$$|\hat{w}_0(t)| \le |\hat{w}_0(0)| + 2 \int_0^t \|w\|_{1/2} \|u\|_{1/2}$$

for all $t \in [0, T_n]$. The result now follows because

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} w(x,t) - 8\pi^3 \hat{w}_0(t) \, \mathrm{d}x = 0$$

so $\|w(t)\|_{H^s} \le c \|w(t)\|_s + c |\hat{w}_0(t)|$. Where c depends only on s. □

Note that we will still use the equivalence of the seminorms $\|\cdot\|_s$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H^s}$ on the homogeneous Sobolev spaces

$$\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^3) \coloneqq \left\{ v \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3) : \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} v(x) \, \mathrm{d}x = 0 \right\}$$

for $s \ge 0$. For example, $\Lambda^\alpha f \in \dot{H}^s$ if $\alpha > 0$ and $f \in H^{s+\alpha}$.

We are now in a position to prove Proposition 5.

Proof. Taking the L^2 product of (10) with Λw_n yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \|w_n\|_{1/2}^2 + \|w_n\|_{3/2}^2 \\
&\qquad \le c \|P_n u\|_{L^6} \|\nabla w_n\|_{L^3} \|w_n\|_1 + c \|\nabla P_n u\|_{L^3} \|w_n\|_{L^3} \|\Lambda w_n\|_{L^3} \\
&\qquad\quad \le c \|u\|_{H^1} \|w_n\|_{1/2}^{1/2} \|w_n\|_{3/2}^{3/2} + c \|u\|_{3/2} \|w_n\|_{H^{1/2}} \|w_n\|_{3/2} \\
&\qquad\qquad \le c \|u\|_{H^1}^4 \|w_n\|_{1/2}^2 + c \|u\|_{3/2}^2 \|w_n\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|w_n\|_{3/2}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where we have used the Sobolev embeddings $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^6$, $H^{1/2} \hookrightarrow L^3$ and the interpolation $\|w_n\|_1 \leq \|w_n\|_{1/2}^{1/2}\|w_n\|_{3/2}^{1/2}$.

By Lemma 6 and the embedding $H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^3) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$ we have

$$\|w_n(t)\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 \leq c\|w_n\|_{1/2}^2 + c\left(\int_0^t \|w_n(s)\|_{1/2}\|u(s)\|_{1/2}\mathrm{d}s\right)^2 + c\|w_n(0)\|_{H^{1/2}}^2.$$

Hence, after integrating, (12) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\|w_n(t)\|_{1/2}^2 + \int_0^t \|w_n(s)\|_{3/2}^2\mathrm{d}s \\ \leq c\int_0^t (\|u(s)\|_{H^1}^4 + \|u(s)\|_{3/2}^2)\|w_n(s)\|_{1/2}^2\mathrm{d}s \\ + c\int_0^t \|u\|_{3/2}^2\mathrm{d}s\left(\int_0^t \|w_n(s)\|_{1/2}\|u(s)\|_{1/2}\mathrm{d}s\right)^2 \\ + \|w_n(0)\|_{H^{1/2}}^2\left(1 + c\int_0^t \|u\|_{3/2}^2\mathrm{d}s\right). \quad (13)\end{aligned}$$

Hence for all $t \in [0, T_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|w_n(t)\|_{1/2}^2 \leq c \sup_{s\in[0,t]} \|w_n(s)\|_{1/2}^2 \left[\int_0^t (\|u(s)\|_{H^1}^4 + \|u(s)\|_{3/2}^2)\mathrm{d}s\right. \\ \left. + t\int_0^t \|u\|_{3/2}^2\mathrm{d}s \int_0^t \|u\|_{1/2}^2\mathrm{d}s\right] + \|w_0\|_{H^{1/2}}^2\left(1 + c\int_0^t \|u\|_{3/2}^2\mathrm{d}s\right). \quad (14)\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\|w_n(t)\|_{1/2}$ is bounded on $[0, T']$, given by

$$\begin{aligned}T' \coloneqq \frac{1}{2}\sup\left\{t \in [0,T) : c\int_0^t (\|u(s)\|_{H^1}^4 + \|u(s)\|_{3/2}^2)\,\mathrm{d}s \right. \\ \left. + ct\int_0^t \|u\|_{3/2}^2\mathrm{d}s \int_0^t \|u\|_{1/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s < 1/2\right\}\end{aligned}$$

where c is the absolute constant from (14). This can also be deduced by applying Lemma A.1 using (14), which is more general.

By (13), we see that $w_n \in L^\infty(0, T'; H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0, T'; H^{3/2})$ is uniformly bounded. Integrating (10) against a function $v \in H^{1/2}$ we also see that $\partial_t w_n$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(0, T'; H^{-1/2})$. By a standard argument using the Aubin–Lions lemma we deduce that there exists a subsequence of $(w_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converging to a limit $w \in L^\infty(0, T'; H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0, T'; H^{3/2})$, such that $\partial_t w \in L^2(0, T'; H^{-1/2})$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty ((u\cdot\nabla)w(s) + (\nabla u)^\top w(s), \phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ = (w_0, \phi(0))_{L^2} + \int_0^\infty (w(s), \partial_t\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s - \int_0^\infty (\nabla w(s), \nabla\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \quad (15)\end{aligned}$$

for any $\phi \in C^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)$. By redefining the limit on a set of times with zero measure we can obtain a strong solution to (8) that is a weakly continuous function of time into L^2 (see [10]). Moreover since $\partial_t w \in L^2(0,T';H^{-1/2})$ and $w \in L^2(0,T';H^{3/2})$, $w \in C^0([0,T];H^{1/2})$ (see [18]).

To construct a solution on $[0,T) \supseteq [0,T']$ we use the definition of T' and the fact that

$$\int_0^T (\|u(s)\|_{H^1}^4 + \|u(s)\|_{3/2}^2)\,\mathrm{d}s + cT\int_0^T \|u\|_{3/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s \int_0^T \|u\|_{1/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s < \infty$$

to show that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the existence argument above can be repeated a finite number of times to obtain a solution $w \in C([0,T-\varepsilon];H^{1/2})\cap L^2(0,T-\varepsilon;H^{3/2})$ such that $\partial_t w \in L^2(0,T-\varepsilon;H^{-1/2})$.

We also have uniqueness for such solutions w. Indeed (9) is linear in w so it suffices to consider the case $w_0 = 0$. Proceeding formally as we did in the derivation of (14) yields:

$$\sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} \|w\|_{1/2}^2 + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|w(s)\|_{3/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s \le A(t_1,t_2) \sup_{t\in[t_1,t_2]} \|w\|_{1/2}^2 + \|w(t_1)\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 \left(1 + c\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|u(s)\|_{3/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s\right) \tag{16}$$

for any $[t_1,t_2] \subseteq [0,T)$, where

$$A(t_1,t_2) \coloneqq c\int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\|u(s)\|_{H^1}^4 + \|u(s)\|_{3/2}^2)\,\mathrm{d}s + c(t_2-t_1)\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|u(s)\|_{H^{3/2}}^2\,\mathrm{d}s \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|u(s)\|_{1/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Thus, if $[t_1,t_2] \subseteq [0,T)$ such that $A(t_1,t_2) < \frac{1}{2}$ then

$$\|w(t_2)\|_{1/2}^2 \le 2\|w(t_1)\|_{H^{1/2}}^2 \left(1 + c\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \|u(s)\|_{3/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s\right). \tag{17}$$

It follows that if $w(t) = 0$ for $t \in [0,S]$ then it also vanishes on $[S, S+\varepsilon]$ where $A(S,S+\varepsilon) = 1/3$. Since $A(0,T) < \infty$ we can iterate this argument to see that $w \equiv 0$ if $w_0 = 0$.

We can justify (16) by considering a sequence of smooth test functions $\psi_n \in L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ converging to w in $L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ with $\partial_t\psi_n \to \partial_t w$ in $L^2(0,T;H^{-1/2})$. Using $\phi_n = \Lambda\psi_n$ as test functions in (9), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(\Lambda^{1/2}w_0, \Lambda^{1/2}\psi_n(0))_{L^2} + \int_0^t (\Lambda^{1/2}w(s), \partial_t\Lambda^{1/2}\psi_n)\,\mathrm{d}s \\ \to \|w_0\|_{1/2}^2 + \int_0^t \langle \Lambda^{1/2}w(s), \partial_t\Lambda^{1/2}w(s)\rangle_{H^1\times H^{-1}}\,\mathrm{d}s \\ = \frac{1}{2}\|w(t)\|_{1/2}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|w_0\|_{1/2}^2,\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

as $n \to \infty$, for all $t \in [0,T)$. For the other terms in (9) we use

$$\int_0^t ((u\cdot\nabla)w(s) + (\nabla u)^\top w(s), \Lambda\psi_n(s))_{L^2} + (\Lambda^{3/2}w(s), \Lambda^{3/2}\psi_n(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s$$
$$\leq c\int_0^t \|u\|_{H^1}\|\nabla w\|_1\|\psi_n\|_{3/2} + \|u\|_{3/2}\|w\|_{1/2}\|\psi_n\|_{3/2} + \|w\|_{3/2}\|\psi_n\|_{3/2}\,\mathrm{d}s, \tag{19}$$

then proceed as in the formal calculation. We also need to check that Lemma 6 can be strengthened to apply to weak solutions, but this can be proved by setting $\phi \equiv 1$ in (9) and considering Fourier expansions.

Hence (16) also holds for solutions of (9), and so w is the unique solution. We have now proved Proposition 5. □

2.4 Equivalence for strong solutions

In the previous section we proved well-posedness for strong solutions of (8), given a fixed $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$. In this section we will show that if we also assume that u is a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equaitions then $u = \mathbb{P}w$, subject to choosing the initial data w_0 such that $\mathbb{P}w_0 = u_0$.

Proposition 7. *If $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ is a weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations and $\mathbb{P}w_0 = u_0$ then the corresponding solution w of (9) satisfies $\mathbb{P}w = u$, i.e. (u,w) satisfy (3) and (4) in a weak sense.*

Proof. Fix a weak solution $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ of the Navier–Stokes equations and let $w \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ be the corresponding solution of (9). Then $v \coloneqq \mathbb{P}w$ satisfies

$$(v(t),\phi(t))_{L^2} + \int_0^t ((u\cdot\nabla)v(s) + (\nabla u)^\top v(s), \phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s$$
$$= (v_0,\phi(0))_{L^2} + \int_0^t (v(s), \partial_t\phi(s))\,\mathrm{d}s - \int_0^t (\nabla v(s), \nabla\phi(s))_{L^2}\mathrm{d}s \tag{20}$$

for all $t \in [0,T)$ and all $\phi \in C_c^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)$ such that $\nabla\cdot\phi = 0$. Indeed, if u and w are smooth we can write $v = w - \nabla q$ and treat the nonlinear terms as follows:

$$((u\cdot\nabla)w + (\nabla u)^\top w, \phi) = ((u\cdot\nabla)v + (\nabla u)^\top v + (u\cdot\nabla)\nabla q + (\nabla u)^\top\nabla q, \phi)$$
$$= ((u\cdot\nabla)v + (\nabla u)^\top v, \phi)\,.$$

For weak solutions, we can justify this with sequences of approximations (see the proof of Proposition 3).

Notice that the equations (9) and (20) differ only in the space of allowed test functions. Now by a uniqueness argument analogous to the

one above for (9), we see that a divergence-free strong solution of (20), $v \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$, is unique.

From the hypothesis that u solves the Navier–Stokes equations, we deduce that u solves (20), indeed using the substitution $v = u$ the nonlinear term becomes

$$((u \cdot \nabla)u + \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla|u|^2, \phi)_{L^2} = ((u \cdot \nabla)u, \phi)_{L^2},$$

since $\nabla \cdot \phi = 0$. It therefore follows from the uniqueness of strong solutions of (20) that $u = v = \mathbb{P}w$ as claimed. □

3 Global well-posedness for a related system

So far, we have considered the magnetization variables in the Navier–Stokes equations and proved the equivalence of the formulations for sufficiently regular weak solutions. Due to this equivalence, we do not expect to the reformulation to immediatley yield new information about the Navier–Stokes equations. However, in this section we use the reformulation to derive a new model for the equations for which we can prove a global well-posedness result using a maximum principle similar to an analogous property of the Burgers equations. Some other recent studies of reformulated systems were discussed in the introduction.

Recall that the equations satisfied by the magnetization variables is

$$w_t + ((\mathbb{P}w) \cdot \nabla)w + (\nabla \mathbb{P}w)^\top w - \Delta w = 0.$$

We will consider the following simplification, obtained by replacing $\mathbb{P}w$ with w in the second nonlinear term:

$$w_t + ((\mathbb{P}w) \cdot \nabla)w + \frac{1}{2}\nabla|w|^2 - \Delta w = 0. \tag{21}$$

These resemble the 3D viscous Burgers equations, which are a classical variant of the Navier–Stokes equations obtained by removing the pressure term and the incompressibility constraint:

$$w_t + (w \cdot \nabla)w - \Delta w = 0. \tag{22}$$

In [17], we showed that on the torus $\mathbb{T}^3$ and for initial data in $w_0 \in H^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ equation (22) admits a unique strong global solution which is classical for $t > 0$. We will show that similar methods apply to (21), which are closer to the Navier–Stokes equations in the sense that the nonlinear terms would have to be altered more significantly to obtain the Burgers equations. Moreover we will see that unlike solutions of the Burgers equations, solutions of (21) have constant momentum – a property shared with solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations.

We divide the proof of well-posedness for (21) into two parts: first we prove the global well-posedness of weak solutions for initial data $w_0 \in H^1$; then show a local well-posedness result for $w_0 \in H^{1/2}$ that combines with the H^1 result to give global well-posedness in this case. The local existence result in $H^{1/2}$ is based on the approach described in [14].

The main estimates we use to deduce global well-posedness arise from the following maximum principle for classical solutions of (21) that we have adapted from [11]:

Lemma 8. *If u is a classical solution of (21) on a time interval $[a, b]$ then*

$$\sup_{t\in[a,b]} \|w(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|w(a)\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{23}$$

Proof. Fix $\alpha > 0$ and let $v(t, x) := \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha t} w(x, t)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$. Then $|v|^2$ satisfies the equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}|v|^2 + 2\alpha|v|^2 + \nabla|v|^2 w + (\mathbb{P}w) \cdot \nabla|v|^2 - 2\nu v \cdot \Delta v = 0. \tag{24}$$

Since $2v \cdot \Delta v = \Delta|v|^2 - 2|\nabla v|^2$ we see that if $|v|^2$ has a local maximum at $(x, t) \in (a, b] \times \mathbb{T}^3$ then the left-hand side of (24) is positive unless $|v(x, t)| = 0$. Hence

$$\|w(t)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \mathrm{e}^{\alpha t}\|w(a)\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Now (23) follows because $\alpha > 0$ was arbitrary. □

As we saw in the previous section, solutions of (3) for fixed u, do not neccesarily have constant momentum (a similar technicality occurs for the Burgers equations, see [17]). This added some complications to the proof of the well-posedness for these systems, namely that we needed to use the form of the equations to estimate inhomogeneous Sobolev norms with homogeneous ones. However, in the case of (21), like the Navier–Stokes equations, initial data with zero average gives rise to solutions that also have this property for positive times. To see this formally, we integrate (21) over $\mathbb{T}^3$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} w \,\mathrm{d}x = -\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} ((\mathbb{P}w) \cdot \nabla)w + \frac{1}{2}\nabla|w|^2 - \Delta w \,\mathrm{d}x = 0$$

where the first term on the right-hand side vanishes because $\mathbb{P}w$ is weakly divergence free and the other terms vanish by periodicity. For this reason, in what follows, we will prove well-posedness for solutions in certain homogeneous Sobolev spaces $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$.

As in the previous section we will at first consider a weak formulation of (21). We call $w \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2) \cap L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^1)$ a weak solution of (21) with

initial data $w_0 \in L^2$ if

$$\int_0^t (((\mathbb{P}w)\cdot\nabla)w(s) + (\nabla w)^\top w, \phi(s))_{L^2} + (\nabla w(s), \nabla\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s$$
$$= (w_0, \phi(0))_{L^2} - (w(t), \phi(t))_{L^2} + \int_0^t (w(s), \partial_t\phi(s))_{L^2}\,\mathrm{d}s \quad (25)$$

for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty([0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)$ and all $t \in [0,T)$.

We have not been able to find weak solutions of (21) directly, as we would for the Navier–Stokes equations. Indeed, the second nonlinear term does not seem amenable to the necesary energy estimates if we only have $w_0 \in L^2$. However for $w_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}$ we will show that there exists a unique weak solution $w \in L^\infty(0,T;\dot{H}^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{3/2})$ for some $T > 0$. We call solutions that are at least this regular *strong solutions*. Moreover, we will show that the solutions become smooth, immediately after the initial time, and can be extended to solutions on $[0,\infty)$.

Again, we will prove well-posedness of strong solutions using Galerkin approximations. For fixed $w_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}$ we denote by $w_n \in C^\infty([0,T_n]\times\mathbb{T}^3)$ the solution of the truncated equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}w_n + P_n\left[((\mathbb{P}w_n)\cdot\nabla)w_n + \frac{1}{2}\nabla|w_n|^2\right] - \Delta w_n = 0 \quad (26)$$

with initial data $P_n w_0$. Here $T_n > 0$ is the maximal existence time for the solution w_n, of this system of quadratic ODEs.

We can now state the main result of this section.

Theorem 9. *Given $w_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}(\mathbb{T}^3)$ there exists a unique global strong solution of (21) $w \in C^0([0,\infty);\dot{H}^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,\infty;\dot{H}^{3/2})$ such that $w(0,x) = w_0(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$. Moreover $w \in C^1((0,\infty);C^0(\mathbb{T}^3)) \cap C^0((0,\infty);C^2(\mathbb{T}^3))$ is a classical solution, except at time $t = 0$.*

This result is a consequence of the following two theorems.

Theorem 10. *If $w_0 \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$ there exists a unique global solution of (21) $w \in C^0([0,\infty);\dot{H}^1) \cap L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^2)$ such that $w(0) = w_0$. Moreover $w \in C^1((0,\infty);C^0(\mathbb{T}^3)) \cap C^0((0,\infty);C^2(\mathbb{T}^3))$ is a classical solution, except possibly at time $t = 0$.*

In the case of initial data in $\dot{H}^1$, we will obtain local well-posedness and smoothness in the same way as we can for the Navier–Stokes equations. Global well-posedness then follows, using estimates that make use of maximum principle (Lemma 8).

Theorem 11. *For any $w_0 \in \dot{H}^{1/2}$ there exists a unique strong solution of (21) on $[0,T)$ for some $T > 0$.*

The proof of this follows the method of [1] (See also [2] or [14] for expositions) in which we decompose the equations into a heat part and a nonlinear part with vanishing initial data.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 10

First, note that if w_n satisfies (26) then, by the arguments above,

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} w_n(x,t)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} P_n w_0(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0.$$

Integrating (26) against $2\Lambda^2 w_n$, and proceeding as for strong solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations (see[20], for example), yields

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|w_n\|_1^2 + \|w_n(t)\|_2^2 \le c\|w_n(t)\|_1^6 \tag{27}$$

for all $t \in [0, T_n]$ and some $c > 0$. Considering only the terms in $\|w_n\|_1^2$ and solving the resulting differential inequality, we obtain

$$\|w_n(t)\|_1^2 \le \frac{\|P_n w_0\|_1^2}{\sqrt{1 - 2ct\|P_n w_0\|_1^4}}.$$

Fixing $T < (2c\|w_0\|_1^4)^{-1}$, it follows from maximality of T_n that $T_n > T$ and $\|w_n(t)\|_1$ is bounded, independent of n, on $[0, T)$. From (27), it then follows that w_n is uniformly bounded in $L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^2)$.

Using these uniform bounds we have the following bounds on the nonlinear terms from (26) in $L^2(0, T; L^2)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |(\nabla w_n)^\top w_n|^2\right)^{1/2} &\le \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |\nabla w_n|^3\right)^{1/3} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} |w_n|^6\right)^{1/6} \\ &\le c\|w_n\|_{H^{3/2}}\|w_n\|_{H^1} \in L^2(0,T).\end{aligned}$$

A similar estimate holds for the other nonlinear term, hence $\partial_t w_n$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(0, T; L^2)$. By the Aubin–Lions lemma, there exists a subsequence relabeled $w_n \to w \in L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^1)$ such that also $\partial_t w \in L^2(0, T; L^2)$, $w \in C([0, T); \dot{H}^1) \cap L^2(0, T; \dot{H}^2)$ and w is a strong solution of (25).

To prove that w is a classical solution after the initial time, we have the following lemma. We omit the proof because it is very similar to arguments applicable to the Navier–Stokes equations which are described in [3] and [19], for example.

Lemma 12. *If the approximations w_n are uniformly bounded in $L^2(\varepsilon, T; \dot{H}^s)$ for $s > 3/2$ and some $\varepsilon \ge 0$ such that $\|w_n(\varepsilon)\|_s < \infty$, then they are also bounded uniformly in $L^\infty(\varepsilon, T; \dot{H}^s) \cap L^2(\varepsilon, T; \dot{H}^{s+1})$.*

Applying this lemma five times, we see that $(w_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a bounded sequence in $L^\infty(\varepsilon, T; \dot{H}^6)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$. Using the Banach algebra property of H^s for $s > 3/2$, this gives us the following estimates on the time derivatives of w_n:

$$\sup_{t\in(\varepsilon,T)} \left\|\frac{\partial w_n}{\partial t}(t)\right\|_4 \le c \sup_{t\in(\varepsilon,T)} (\|w_n(t)\|_4\|w_n(t)\|_5 + \|w_n(t)\|_6)$$

and (differentiating (26))

$$\sup_{t\in(\varepsilon,T)}\left\|\frac{\partial^2 w_n}{\partial t^2}(t)\right\|_2 \le c\sup_{t\in(\varepsilon,T)}\left(\left\|\frac{\partial w_n}{\partial t}(t)\right\|_4+\left\|\frac{\partial w_n}{\partial t}(t)\right\|_2\|w_n(t)\|_3 + \left\|\frac{\partial w_n}{\partial t}(t)\right\|_3\|w_n(t)\|_2\right).$$

Therefore w_n is uniformly bounded in $H^2(\varepsilon,T;\dot{H}^2)\cap H^1(\varepsilon,T;\dot{H}^4)$. This regularity passes to the limit; hence by Sobolev embeddings $w\in C^1(0,T;C^0)\cap C^0(0,T;C^2)$ is a classical solution on $[\varepsilon,T]$. Note that we may consider a closed interval by using the above argument on a larger open interval.

Since w is a classical solution we can apply Lemma 8 to obtain

$$\sup_{t\in[\varepsilon,T]}\|w(t)\|_{L^\infty}\le\|w(\varepsilon)\|_{L^\infty}.$$

This allows the following additional H^1 estimate:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|w\|_1^2\le|(2((\mathbb{P}w)\cdot\nabla)w+\nabla|w|^2,-\Delta w)_{L^2}|-2\|w\|_2^2\le c\|w\|_{L^\infty}^2\|w\|_1^2. \quad (28)$$

Notice that care must be taken with the first nonlinear term because $\mathbb{P}w$ is an unbounded operator on L^∞. We therefore argue using the anti-symmetry, $(\mathbb{P}w\cdot\nabla v_1,v_2)_{L^2}=-(\mathbb{P}w\cdot\nabla v_2,v_1)_{L^2}$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&((\mathbb{P}w\cdot\nabla)w,-\partial_{xx}w)_{L^2}=(\partial_x[(\mathbb{P}w\cdot\nabla)w],\partial_x w)_{L^2}\\ &=((\mathbb{P}\partial_x w\cdot\nabla)w,\partial_x w)_{L^2}+((\mathbb{P}w\cdot\nabla\partial_x w),\partial_x w)_{L^2}=-((\mathbb{P}\partial_x w\cdot\nabla)\partial_x w,w)_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

for any spatial derivative ∂_x. Hence the inequality

$$|((\mathbb{P}w)\cdot\nabla)w,-\Delta w)_{L^2}|\le\|w\|_1\|w\|_2\|w\|_{L^\infty},$$

holds, in the absence of L^∞ bounds on $\mathbb{P}w$.

From (28) and Lemma 8, it follows that for all $t\in[0,T)$

$$\|w(t)\|_1^2\le\|w_0\|_1^2\mathrm{e}^{ct\|w_0\|_{L^\infty}^2}.$$

This rules out the finite-time blowup of $\|w(t)\|_1$, therefore since we can extend a solution on $[0,T)$ onto $[0,T+\delta)$ where $\delta\propto\|w(T)\|_1^{-4}$, there exists a solution $w\in C^1([0,\infty);C^0)\cap C^0([0,\infty);C^2)$.

We have now proved that for initial data in $\dot{H}^1$ there exists a global weak solution to (21) that is classical, except possibly at the initial time. To complete the proof of Theorem 10 it remains to show that these solutions are unique. The following lemma also shows that even less regular solutions are unique and will be useful in the next section.

Lemma 13. *If w_1, $w_2\in L^\infty(0,T;\dot{H}^{1/2})\cap L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{3/2})$ are strong solutions of (25) corresponding to the same initial data $w_0\in\dot{H}^{1/2}$ then $w_1=w_2$.*

Proof. Let $(\psi_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of spatially-periodic test functions in $\psi_n \in C_c^{\infty}([0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\psi_n(t)=0$ for all $t\in[0,T)$ and $\psi_n \to w_1-w_2$ in $L^2(0,T;\dot{H}^{3/2})$. Set $\phi_n := \Lambda^1\psi_n$ in (25), then the difference w_1-w_2 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}(\Lambda^{1/2}(w_1-w_2),\Lambda^{1/2}\psi_n)_{L^2} &+ \int_0^t (\Lambda^{1/2}\nabla(w_1-w_2),\Lambda^{1/2}\nabla\psi_n)\\ &- \int_0^t (\Lambda^{1/2}(w_1-w_2)(s),\partial_t\Lambda^{1/2}\psi_n(s))\,\mathrm{d}s\\ \leq c\int_0^t (\|w_1-w_2\|_{1/2}\|w_1\|_{3/2} &+ \|w_2\|_1\|w_1-w_2\|_1)\|\psi_n\|_{3/2}\,\mathrm{d}s\\ +c\int_0^t (\|w_1-w_2\|_1\|w_1\|_1 &+ \|w_2\|_{3/2}\|w_1-w_2\|_{1/2})\|\psi_n\|_{3/2}\,\mathrm{d}s,\end{aligned}$$

for all $t\in[0,T)$ and every n. Hence, letting $n\to\infty$ (arguing as we did in Section 2.3), and applying Young's inequality in the usual way, we see that

$$\|w_1-w_2(t)\|_{1/2}^2 \leq c\int_0^t (\|w_1\|_{3/2}^2+\|w_2\|_{3/2}^2+\|w_1\|_1^4+\|w_2\|_1^4)\|w_1-w_2\|_{1/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s$$

for almost all $t\in[0,T)$. Since the parenthesised part of the integral is in $L^1(0,T)$, Gronwall's Lemma now implies that $\|w_1-w_2(t)\|_{1/2}=0$ for all $t\in[0,T)$. □

3.2 Proof of Theorem 11

In this section we prove the local well-posedness of (21) with initial data $w_0\in\dot{H}^{1/2}$. Uniqueness follows from Lemma 13, so it suffices to prove local existence of strong solutions.

Following [1], [14], and [17], we find the necessary estimates by decomposing the Galerkin approximations w_n, which solve (26), into a sum $w_n = v_n + z_n$ where

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t v_n - \Delta v_n = 0\\ \quad v_n(0) = P_n w_0\end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t z_n - \Delta z_n = -P_n\left[((\mathbb{P}w_n)\cdot\nabla)w_n + \dfrac{1}{2}\nabla|w_n|^2\right]\\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad z_n(0)=0.\end{cases} \tag{29}$$

From the heat equation satisfied by v_n, it is easy to check that for any $t\geq 0$ and any n

$$\|v_n(t)\|_{1/2}^2 + 2\int_0^t \|v_n(s)\|_{3/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s \leq \|P_n w_0\|_{1/2}^2, \tag{30}$$

hence $v_n \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ is uniformly bounded (independent of n and t). It therefore suffices to find estimates on z in the same spaces.

Integrating (29) against Λz_n yields

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\|z_n(t)\|_{1/2}^2 + \|z_n(t)\|_{3/2}^2 &\le |(((\mathbb{P}w_n)\cdot\nabla)w_n + (\nabla w_n)^\top w_n, \Lambda^1 z_n)_{L^2}| \\ &\le c\|w_n(t)\|_1^2\|z_n(t)\|_{3/2} \\ &\le c\|v_n\|_1^4 + \frac{1}{2}\|z_n\|_{3/2}^2 + \|z_n\|_{3/2}^2\|z_n\|_{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the same Sobolev embeddings and interpolations for $H^{1/2}$ and $H^{3/2}$ as we did in Section 2.

After simplifying this inequality and integrating over $[0,t]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|z_n(t)\|_{1/2}^2 + \int_0^t \|z_n(s)\|_{3/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s \le c\int_0^t \|v_n(s)\|_1^4\,\mathrm{d}s + \frac{1}{2}\sup_{s\in[0,t]}\|z_n(s)\|_{1/2}^2 \\ + \frac{1}{2}\left(\int_0^t \|z_n(s)\|_{3/2}^2\,\mathrm{d}s\right)^2,\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied Young's inequality to the last term.

Since $\|v_n\|_1 \le \|v\|_1$ where v solves

$$v_t - \Delta v = 0,\ v(0) = w_0,$$

and $v \in L^4(0,t;\dot{H}^1)$ for all $t > 0$ we can make the first term on the right-hand side independent of n. This gives an estimate of the form

$$\sup_{s\in[0,t]} f_n(s) + \int_0^t g_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \le A(t)\sup_{s\in[0,t]} f_n(s) + B(t)\left(\int_0^t g_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\right)^2 + C(t),$$

where $f_n(t) \coloneqq \|z_n(t)\|_{1/2}^2$,

$$g_n(t) \coloneqq \|z_n(t)\|_{3/2}^2,$$

$A \equiv 0$, $B \equiv \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$C(t) \coloneqq c\int_0^t \|v_n(s)\|_1^4\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

This allows us to apply Lemma A.1 to find $T > 0$ independent of n such that f_n and g_n are uniformly bounded.

It follows that w_n uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$ independent of n. As in the existence argument from Section 2 we also have bounds on $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}w_n \in L^2(0,T;H^{-1/2})$, independent of n. Therefore, by the Aubin–Lions lemma, passing to a subsequence we may assume that w_n converges in $L^2(0,T;H^{1/2})$ to a limit w that is a strong solution of (21).

Since for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $t \in (0,\varepsilon)$ such that $w(t) \in \dot{H}^1$, Theorem 10 implies that w is a classical solution on $(0,T)$ and can be extended to a classical solution on $(0,\infty)$. By Lemma 13 this solution is unique. Thus Theorem 9 is proved. □

4 Conclusions

We have reviewed how the Navier–Stokes equations can be reformulated using a magnetisation variable:

$$w_t + (u \cdot \nabla)w + (\nabla u)^\top w - \nu \Delta w = 0 \tag{31}$$

$$u = \mathbb{P}w.$$

The two systems were known to be equivalent in the sense of classical solutions. We discussed how the systems correspond in the setting of weak and strong solutions. In particular, we showed that a weak solution of (31) gives rise to unique weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations. Conversely weak solutions of the Navier–Stokes equations correspond to families of functions that satisfy a weak version of (31) but only when tested against divergence-free functions.

We then proved that for a more regular weak solution of the Navier–Stokes equations $u \in L^\infty(0,T;H^{1/2}) \cap L^2(0,T;H^{3/2})$, there exists a unique strong solution of (31) (subject to the choice of initial data such that $\mathbb{P}w_0 = u_0$).

In Section 3 we proved global well-posedness and regularity results for a system obtained by replacing the second nonlinear term $(\nabla \mathbb{P}w)^\top w$ with $(\nabla w)^\top w = \frac{1}{2}\nabla |w|^2$. The new system (21) exhibited conservation of momentum, like the Navier–Stokes equations, but admitted a simple maximum-principle, like the Burgers equations.

In view of these results, it would be interesting to investigate the well-posedness, or otherwise, of a system

$$w_t + (\nabla \mathbb{P}w)^\top w - \Delta w = 0 \tag{32}$$

obtained by taking only the nonlinear term from (31) that was replaced in (21) because it caused the proof of the maximum principle to fail.

A Appendix: Lower bounds on existence times for the Galerkin approximations

In this appendix we prove a useful but technical lemma that allows us to deduce lower bounds on the existence times of solutions to certain sequences of systems of ODEs. For example, in proving local existence results for some of the PDEs in this paper, it is necessary to control the existence times of Galerkin approximations where $f_n = \|u_n\|_{1/2}^2$ and $g_n = \|u_n\|_{3/2}^2$ satisfy an inequality of the form (33). Since similar arguments also appear in relation to the Navier–Stokes equations [14] and Burgers equations [17], when Calderón's method [1] of "splitting the equations and the data" is employed, we have encapsulated the somewhat subtle technicalities in Lemma A.1.

The hypotheses made in the lemma about $f_n : [0, T_n) \to \mathbb{R}$ can be understood in the context of solutions to ODEs as follows. Suppose that T_n is the maximal existence time for a solution and that f_n is a function of the solution such that $f_n(t) \uparrow \infty$ as $t \uparrow T^*$ if and only if the solution blows up at time T^*; then either $T_n = T_0$ (some upper bound T_0, independent of n arising from the coefficients of the equations) or the solution cannot be extended beyond $T_n \in [0, T_0)$ and f_n blows up at T_n.

Lemma A.1. *Let $(T_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of times $T_n \in (0, T_0]$ and let $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, $(g_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be two sequences of non-negative functions $f_n, g_n : [0, T_n) \to \mathbb{R}$, such that g_n is measurable. In addition, suppose that for each n, either $T_n = T_0$ or $f_n \to \infty$ as $t \uparrow T_n$, T_n being the first such blowup time, and*

$$\sup_{s\in[0,t]} f_n(s) + \int_0^t g_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq A(t) \sup_{s\in[0,t]} f_n(s) + B(t)\left(\int_0^t g_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s\right)^2 + C(t) \tag{33}$$

for all $t \in [0, T_n)$, where $A, B, C : [0, T_0] \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous non-decreasing, non-negative, functions such that $A(t) \to 0$ and $B(t)C(t) \to 0$ as $t \downarrow 0$. Then there exists $T \in (0, T_0]$ independent of n such that

$$f_n(t) + \int_0^t g_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq 2C(T)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all n.

Proof. We define

$$\tau_n \coloneqq \sup\left\{t \in [0, T_n] \;:\; A(t) + B(t)\int_0^t g_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq 1/2\right\} > 0.$$

Note that if $\tau_n < T_n$ then, since A and B are continuous,

$$A(\tau_n) + B(\tau_n)\int_0^{\tau_n} g_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s = 1/2. \tag{34}$$

By (33), for all s, t such that $s < t \leq \tau_n$ we have

$$\sup_{r\in[0,s]} f_n(r) + \int_0^s g_n(r)\,\mathrm{d}r \leq \frac{1}{2}\sup_{r\in[0,s]} f_n(r) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^s g_n(r)\,\mathrm{d}r + C(t),$$

in particular $f_n(s) + \int_0^s g_n(r)\,\mathrm{d}r \leq 2C(\tau_n)$, and it remains to find a lower bound on τ_n. Of course, we also have

$$\int_0^{\tau_n} g_n(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \leq 2C(\tau_n).$$

Let

$$T' \coloneqq \sup\{t \in [0, T_0] : A(t) + 2B(t)C(t) < 1/2\},$$

then $T' > 0$ by continuinty (we assumed that $A(0) + 2B(0)C(0) = 0$).

Suppose, for contradiction, that $T' > \tau_n$ then

$$A(\tau_n) + B(\tau_n) \int_0^{\tau_n} g_n(r)\,\mathrm{d}r \leq A(\tau_n) + 2B(\tau_n)C(\tau_n) < 1/2.$$

If $\tau_n < T_n$, this is a contradiction to (34). Otherwise $\tau_n = T_n$, in which case $f_n(t) \leq 2C(T_n)$ for $t < T_n$, so no blowup occurs at time T_n, hence $\tau_n = T_n = T_0 \geq T'$ by hypothesis. This is also a contradiction to the supposition that $T' > \tau_n$.

In either case, it follows that $T_n \geq \tau_n \geq T'$ for all n. Fixing any $T < T'$ (or $T = T'$ if $T' \neq T_n$ for all n), we have $f_n(t) + \int_0^t g_n(r)\,\mathrm{d}r \leq 2C(T)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, as required. □

References

[1] C.P. Calderón. Existence of weak solutions for the Navier-Stokes equations with initial data in L^p. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc*, 318(1):179–200, 1990.

[2] J.Y. Chemin, B. Desjardins, I. Gallagher, and E. Grenier. *Mathematical Geophysics: An introduction to rotating fluids and the Navier-Stokes equations*, volume 32 of *Oxford lecture series in mathematics and its applications*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.

[3] P. Constantin and C. Foias. *Navier-Stokes Equations*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1988.

[4] D. Chae. Global regularity for a model Navier–Stokes equations on $\mathbb{R}^3$. *To appear*, 2015.

[5] A.J. Chorin. *Vorticity and Turbulence*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.

[6] P. Constantin. An Eulerian-Lagrangian Approach For Incompressible Fluids: Local Theory. *Journal of the AMS*, 14(2):263–278, 2000.

[7] L.C. Evans. *Partial differential equations: second edition*. American Mathematical Society, Providence R.I., 2010.

[8] C. Fefferman. Existence and Smoothness of the Navier-Stokes Equation. In J.A. Carlson, A. Jaffe, and A. Wiles, editors, *The Millenium Prize Problems*. AMS, 2006.

[9] H. Fujita and T. Kato. On the Navier–Stokes initial value problem. I. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 16:269–315, 1964.

[10] G.P. Galdi. An Introduction to the Navier-Stokes Initial-Boundary Value Problem. In G.P. Galdi, J.G. Heywood, and R. Rannacher, editors, *Fundamental Directions in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*. Birkhuser-Verlag, 2000.

[11] A. Kiselev and O. Ladyzhenskaya. On the existence and uniqueness of the solution of the nonstationary problem for a viscous, incompressible fluid. (Russian). *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat.*, 21:655–680, 1957.

[12] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya. *The mathematical theory of viscous incompressible flow*. Gordon & Breach, New York, 1969.

[13] J. Leray. Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace. *Acta Math.*, 63:193–248, 1934.

[14] P. Marín-Rubio, J.C. Robinson, and W. Sadowski. Solutions of the 3D NavierStokes equations for initial data in $H^{1/2}$: Robustness of regularity and numerical verification of regularity for bounded sets of initial data in H^1. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 400:76–85, 2013.

[15] S. Montgomery-Smith and M. Pokorný. A counterexample to the smoothness of the solution to an equation arising in fluid mechanics. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.*, 43:61–75, 2001.

[16] B.C. Pooley and J.C. Robinson. An Eulerian-Lagrangian form for the Euler equations in Sobolev spaces. To appear in *J. Math. Fluid Mech.*. DOI: 10.1007/s00021-016-0271-8

[17] B.C. Pooley and J.C. Robinson. Well-posedness for the diffusive 3D Burgers equations with initial data in $H^{1/2}$. In *Recent Progress in the Theory of the Euler and Navier–Stokes Equations*, eds. J.C. Robinson, J.L. Rodrigo, W. Sadowski and A. Vidal-López, Cambridge University Press, 2016.

[18] J.C. Robinson. *Infinite-Dimensional Dynamical Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[19] J.C. Robinson. The 3D Navier-Stokes equations. *Bol. Soc. Esp. Mat. Apl. Sema*, 35:43–71, 2006.

[20] J.C. Robinson, J.L. Rodrigo, and W. Sadowski. *The three–dimensional Navier–Stokes equations. Classical Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.

[21] T. Tao. Finite time blowup for an averaged three-dimensional Navier–Stokes equation. *Arxiv preprint*, 2014. arXiv:1402.0290 [math.AP].

[22] W. Weber. Uber eine Transformation der Hydrodynamischen Gleichungen. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 68:286–292, 1868.